Graduation Portfolio Reviewer Training Design

Center for Research, Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing

Explanation and Considerations for Use

This sample reviewer training design describes one process for introducing reviewers to their process of reviewing student graduation portfolios and cultivating inter-rater reliability and adherence to a scoring protocol. It is adapted from materials created by the Center for Research, Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST). For current information on CRESST and other resources relating to assessment, visit http://www.cresst.org

Sample Graduation Portfolio Judge Training Design

1. **Introduce yourself, and ask judges to introduce themselves.**

2. **Describe the Graduation Portfolio and its role in RI's Diploma System.**

Explain the structure and purpose of the Graduation Portfolio, as well as the types of knowledge and skills targeted in the Graduation Portfolio.

Explain that scoring Graduation Portfolios may be different from other kinds of scoring experiences judges have previously had, that it is important to keep in mind that the Graduation Portfolio is designed to assess only certain kinds of knowledge and skills, and that the Graduation Portfolio is just one component of the assessment system that will be used to evaluate student proficiency.

3. **Ask judges to read a description of the Graduation Portfolio** and any other material in their Scoring Packets that will help them understand the Graduation Portfolio more deeply.

4. **Review rubric(s) with judges.** Read aloud the description of each score point in the rubric and explain that the 4-point scale reflects distinct levels of proficiency as defined by the district and/or RIDE.

5. **Discuss Anchor Portfolios.** Read information such as the following to judges:

"The Graduation Portfolio rubric was designed for use in conjunction with a set of Anchor Portfolios that was selected by (Name of School) staff. Anchor Portfolios illustrate the score criteria contained in the rubric. Each of the Anchor Portfolios represents the lowest performance level on a Graduation Portfolio at a given score point. Graduation Portfolios that show a lower level of performance than an Anchor Portfolio must be assigned a lower score than the Anchor Portfolio.

In this training, you will view Anchor Portfolios for score points 2, 3, and 4. An Anchor Portfolio for score point 1 is not included since any Graduation Portfolio demonstrating lower knowledge or skill than an Anchor 2 should receive a score of 1."

Begin the discussion of each Anchor Portfolio by showing the portfolio. Start with Anchor 2. After showing each Anchor Portfolio, briefly discuss the qualities of the Graduation Portfolio, referring to the Anchor Portfolio Commentaries in their scoring packets. Ask judges if they can see why each Anchor Portfolio received the score it did.

After viewing all of the Anchor Portfolios, discuss the distinctions between the levels of performance between Anchor 2 and Anchor 3 and between Anchor 3 and Anchor 4. Help to clarify the distinctions by referring to the rubric as needed.

Remind judges that each Anchor Portfolio represents the lowest level of performance at that score point. When assigning a particular score to a Graduation Portfolio, the judge should be confident that the Graduation Portfolio demonstrates a level of performance that is equal to or higher than that of the Anchor Portfolio for that score.

Remind judges that they must refer to BOTH the rubric and Anchor Portfolio Commentaries when they are scoring Graduation Portfolios. They should not use any other criteria.

6. Score Training Portfolios.

After reviewing the rubric and the Anchor Portfolios, the judges are now ready to score a set of at least three Training Portfolios (A through C). Training Portfolios are Graduation Portfolios that have been previously assigned scores by expert judges. The main goal of this part of the training is to obtain agreement (at least 70%) among the raters.

Complete each of these steps:

a. Score Training Portfolio A.

Instruct judges to examine Training Portfolio A. Remind them to compare what they see in the portfolio to the Anchor Portfolios and the rubric criteria. Judges should use the Training Paper Score Sheet in their packets to record their score for each Training Portfolio.

Once all judges have viewed and scored Training Portfolio A, ask how many judges scored that Graduation Portfolio at each of the score points and record that number on the Rater Agreement Summary Sheet, as shown below:

Training Portfolio	Score			
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
A	1	4	1	0
B				
C				

Then, circle the number in each row that contains the highest number (e.g., the number "4" under score point 2 for Training Portfolio A). At this point, the group can discuss the qualities of the Graduation Portfolio that was examined, referring to the anchor papers and rubric. At the end of this discussion, reveal the previously assigned score, found on the Training Portfolio Key.

b. Score Training Portfolio B.

Instruct judges to score Training Portfolio B, following the same process used to score Training Portfolio A.

c. Score Training Portfolio C.

After the first two Training Portfolios are scored and discussed, instruct the judges to score Training Portfolio C, following the same procedures as for Training Portfolio A.

d. Check Judge Agreement.

Every attempt should be made to train judges to obtain exact score agreement with each other. The goal should be to reach at least 70% exact score agreement. You should calculate exact score agreement after the first three Training Portfolios are scored using the following procedure:

Example:

Training Portfolio	Score			
	1	2	3	4
A	1	4	1	0
B	0	2	3	1
C	6	0	0	0

Step 1: First, circle the highest number for each Training Portfolio (e.g., 4 for Training Portfolio A above, 3 for Training Portfolio B, and 6 for Training Portfolio C). This is to calculate the number of times the raters were in highest agreement with each other.

For the example above, this number is **13** (4+3+6=13).

Step 2: Next, multiply the number of judge by the total number of Training Portfolios that were scored.

For the example above, this number is **18** (6 judges x 3 Training Portfolios=18).

Step 3: Then, divide the number of times the judges were in agreement with each other (Step 1) by the total number of Training Portfolios scored (Step 2). This is the percent of exact score agreement for Training Portfolios A-C.

For this example, exact score agreement is **72%** (13÷18=.72).

e. Examine results.

Study the results of the training session and determine next steps.

If you are satisfied with the consistency of scoring on the part of all judges, the training session is complete, and the newly trained judges are ready to begin scoring official Graduation Portfolios.

If you think the group as a whole needs further training, provide extra practice with additional Training Portfolios, if available. If additional Training Portfolios are not available, discuss the features of the Graduation Portfolios in the Training Portfolios and Anchor Portfolios in greater depth and then judge if sufficient judge understanding and agreement is achieved.

If it is clear that an individual judge is not scoring the Training Portfolios in a manner that is consistent with the rubric or with other judges, provide this person with additional training until an acceptable level of consistency is achieved OR do not allow him/her to participate in the official Graduation Portfolio judging process. Do not allow this individual to proceed directly to the official judging process.

(Adapted from *Performance Assignments Scoring Handbook*, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).)